

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1, 4-9, and 11-15 stand rejected.

Claims 2, 3, and 10 have been allowed.

Applicant has amended each of claims 1-15 to replace all occurrences of “said” with “the.” Applicant has substantively amended claims 1 and 15, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,049,129 to Yew et al.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yew et al. (U.S. Patent 6,049,129). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicant asserts that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant respectfully asserts that presently amended independent claims 1 and 15 are not anticipated by Yew et al. because Yew et al. does not expressly or inherently identically describe the element of the claimed invention calling for “a width of [an] adhesive tape extending beyond at least one of an edge of [a] semiconductor substrate opening and an edge of [a] semiconductor die to provide a detectable surface of the...adhesive tape,” as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 15 as currently amended.

Turning to the cited prior art, Yew et al. describes a substantially flat high frequency integrated circuit package having substantially the same outline as the silicon chip. (Col. 1, lines 7-9, Col. 3, lines 16-17). The integrated circuit package 30 comprises a silicon chip 50. Printed circuit board 70 is attached to silicon chip 50 by an adhesive layer 60. Printed circuit board 70 consists of three layers, a top layer 72, an intermediate layer 74, and a bottom layer 76. (Col. 3,

lines 48-57). Intermediate layer 74 has routing strips 82 that are electrically connected through vias 84 to pads 100 located on top surface 92 of top layer 72. (Col. 4, line 66 - Col. 5, line 2). Intermediate layer 74 includes a pair of bus bars 110. These bus bars are electrically connected through vias 84 to one or more pads 110. (Col. 5, lines 7-9). Silicon chip 50 is connected to routing strips 82 and bus bars 110 through bonding pads 120. (Col. 5, lines 14-17). Connections to the routing strips 82 and bus bars 110 are made through opening 86. (FIG. 2). Bus bars 110 are connected to pads 100 by wire bonding through opening 86. (FIGs. 4 and 5, Col. 8, lines 55-58, lines 60-62). Yew et al. describes in drawing Fig. 4. the an integrated circuit package 34 comprising a silicon chip 50 attached to a printed circuit board 70 through the use of an adhesive layer 60 for which a die bonding film comprising a silver filled thermosetting type resin film.

Applicant asserts that Yew et al. does not describe, teach, or suggest an adhesive tape having a width that extends beyond at least one of an edge of a semiconductor substrate opening and an edge of a semiconductor die to provide a detectable surface of the adhesive tape.

Therefore, Applicant asserts that independent claims 1 and 15 are not anticipated by Yew et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of independent claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as such claims are allowable.

Furthermore, Applicant asserts that dependent claims 4-5, 7, 9, and 11-14 are allowable at least because each depends either directly or indirectly from presently amended independent claim 1 (which is allowable for the reasons previously discussed).

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,049,129 to Yew et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,148,266 to Khandros et al.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yew et al. (U.S. Patent 6,049,129) in view of Khandros et al. (U.S. Patent 5,148,266). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

Applicant asserts that dependent claim 6 is allowable because none of the cited prior art references teaches or suggests the claim limitation calling for "a width of [an] adhesive tape extending beyond at least one of an edge of [a]semiconductor substrate opening and an edge of [a] semiconductor die to provide a detectable surface of the...adhesive tape," as recited in independent claim 1 as currently amended, from which dependent claim 6 indirectly depends.

Therefore, Applicant asserts that dependent claim 6 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 considering the teachings of Yew et al. in view of the teachings of Khandros et al., and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent 6,049,129 to Yew et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,612,569 to Murakami et al.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yew et al. (U.S. Patent 6,049,129) in view of Murakami et al. (U.S. Patent 5,612,569). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicant asserts that dependent claim 8 is allowable because none of the cited prior art references teaches or suggests the claim limitation calling for "a width of [an] adhesive tape extending beyond at least one of an edge of [a]semiconductor substrate opening and an edge of [a] semiconductor die to provide a detectable surface of the...adhesive tape," as recited in independent claim 1 as currently amended, from which dependent claim 8 indirectly depends.

Therefore, Applicant asserts that dependent claim 8 is not obvious considering the teachings of Yew et al. in view of the teachings of Murakami et al., and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to claims 1-15 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the disclosure to clearly comply with 35 U.S.C. § 132.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-15 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: November 4, 2005
JRD/ljb:lmh
Document in ProLaw